

United States Patent and Trademark Office

MY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/833,229	04/11/2001	Avram Scheiner	279.337US1	2999
21186 7	7590 10/19/2004		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			MULLEN, KRISTEN DROESCH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MININEZA OBIS, MIN 33102			3762	
		•	DATE MAIL ED. 10/10/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		8	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	09/833,229	SCHEINER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Kristen Mullen	3762	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. a reply within the statutory minimum of the reind will apply and will expire SIX (6) Months and will expire SIX (6) Months are the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2			
7	This action is non-final.	the second of the second of	
3) Since this application is in condition for all			
closed in accordance with the practice und	ier <i>Ex рапе Quayle</i> , 1935 С	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22,56-65 and 73-77</u> is/are pend			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) <u>1-8,59-65 and 73-77</u> is/are allowed	ed.		
6) Claim(s) 9-22 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	•	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are		ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	• , •		
1. Certified copies of the priority docur	nents have been received.		
Certified copies of the priority docur			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		en received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bu	•	at manaissad	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies h	ot received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	5) D N J 1	lo(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
			_

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/23/04 has been entered.

Claim Objections

- Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: "an input devices" in line
 Appropriate correction is required.
- Claims 56-58 are objected to because of the following informalities: "a first date" in lineof claim 56. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 9-11, 13-16, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. (5,792,195) in view of Koestner et al. (5,300,093) and further in view of Leahy et al. (4,964,410).

Regarding claims 9, and 20, Carlson et al. shows a first heart sound sensor, (34) a second cardiac electrical signal sensor (24), a third cardiac electrical signal sensor (26), an first interface

Art Unit: 3762

circuit (42) and a first control circuit (32, 36, 38) that includes a bandpass filter (46), a systole detector, and an ensemble averager (96, 98) (Fig. 2; Col. 6, lines 44 -55; Col. 7, lines 23-58) and an external system (40) with a second interface circuit.

Although Carlson et al. fails to show an output device configured to simultaneously output multiple signals; and a second control circuit coupled to the second interface circuit and the output device configured to receive the first, second, and third data and generate control signals causing the output device to simultaneously output at least the first, second and third sensed signals, attention is directed to Koestner et al. which shows an external monitor and display that is coupled telemetrically to an implantable medical device which is configured to receive the first, second, and third data and generate control signals causing the output device to simultaneously output at least the first, second and third sensed signals (Col. 27, line 9-Col. 32, line 52). Koestner et al. teaches that the simultaneous transmission and display of electrical signals and physiological signals allows the interrelationships between mechanical and electrical cardiac signals to be set forth quickly and easily and greatly enhances the diagnostic information available to the physician (Col. 32, lines 44-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the external system of Carlson et al. with the external system of Koestner et al. in order to quickly and easily set forth the interrelationships between mechanical and electrical cardiac signals and greatly enhance the diagnostic information available to the physician.

Although Carlson et al. and Koestner et al. fail to show a display including a pair of calipers; and an input device adapted to control a position of each caliper of the pair of calipers, attention is directed to Leahey et al. which shows a display including a pair of calipers (A, M)

Art Unit: 3762

and an input device (32) (Col. 3, lines 14-25, Col. 4, line 65-Col. 5, line 6, Figs. 2A-2F). Leahy et al teaches that using a display including a pair of calipers and a input device adapted to control the calipers allows a physician to easily measure the time between two points on the displayed data and increases the speed an accuracy of the measurement since mechanical calipers need not be used (Col. 9, lines 39-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display of Carlson et al. and Koestner et al. to include calipers and an input device for the calipers in order allows a physician to easily measure the time between two points on the displayed data and increase the speed an accuracy of the measurement since mechanical calipers need not be used.

Regarding claims 10-11, and 21, Carlson et al. further shows the heart sound sensor is an accelerometer (34) located internal to the implantable housing (10)

With respect to claim 19, Carlson et al. shows the data transmitted is processed data (Col. 4, lines 46-62).

Regarding claim 13, the second sensor includes an EGM sensing electrode (16, 18, 20, 22) and the second signals are representative of EGM electrical signals.

With respect to claims 14-16, and 22, Carlson et al. shows the second sensor (24) includes an atrial sensing electrode (20, 22), and the third sensor (26) includes a ventricular sense electrode (16,18) wherein the second sensor is disposed in the right side of the heart.

Regarding claim 20, Carlson et al. shows a systole detector where detection of systole triggers the ensemble averager (Col. 6, line 40 –Col. 7, line 13).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. (5,792,195) in view of Koestner et al. (5,300,093) and Leahy et al. (4,964,410), and further in

Application/Control Number: 09/833,229 Page 5

Art Unit: 3762

view of Lekholm (4,763,646). Although Carlson et al., Koestner et al. and Leahy et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the heart sound sensor being located externally from the implantable housing, attention is directed Lekholm who teaches that the heart sound detector can be located on a separate line or on an electrode lead. It would have been an obvious design choice to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sensor as taught by Carlson et al., Koestner et al. and Leahy et al. with the sensor of Lekholm, since applicant has not disclosed that this location of the sensor provides any criticality and /or unexpected results and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any location for the sensor such as the external location taught by Lekholm for detecting heart sounds.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. (5,792,195) in view of Koestner et al. (5,300,093) and Leahy et al. (4,964,410), and further in view of Tockman et al. (5,540,727). Although Carlson et al., Koestner et al. and Leahy et al. disclose the claimed invention except for explicitly teaching the second sensor is located in a left side of a heart, attention is directed to Tockman who shows a similar device with a sensor (27, 29) located in the left side of the heart for sensing ventricular electrical signals (Col. 3, lines 20-28). It would have been an obvious design choice to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the second sensor of Carlson et al., Koestner et al. and Leahy et al. in a left side of a heart, since applicant has not disclosed that this particular location provides any criticality and /or unexpected results and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any location for the second sensor such as the location in a left heart taught by Tockman et al. for sensing left ventricular electrical signals.

Art Unit: 3762

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. (5,792,195) in view of Koestner et al. (5,300,093) and Leahy et al. (4,964,410), and further in view of Turcott (6,409,675). Although Carlson et al., Koestner et al. and Leahy et al. disclose the claimed invention except for explicitly teaching the transmitted data includes raw data determined by digitizing the sensed signals, attention is directed to Turcott which shows raw data can be recorded by an implantable device and transmitted via telemetry to an external processor (Col. 14, lines 38-48). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit raw data rather than processed data because it would be far simpler and the step of processing the data would be omitted. Omission of an element and its function if the function of the element is not desired is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 10. Claims 1-8, 59-65, 73-77 allowed.
- 11. Claims 56-58 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the minor informality objection set forth in this Office action.

Regarding clams 1-8, and 73-75, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest an implantable device with a plurality of implantable heart sound sensors and a control circuit with a first and second processing paths, where the first processing path includes a first band pass

Art Unit: 3762

filter, a rectifier, a low pass filter and a first ensemble averager and a the second processing path includes a second band pass filter and a second ensemble averager.

Regarding claims 56-58, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a method comprising detecting heart sounds using a plurality of implanted sensors, generating first data representative of the heart sounds using band pass filtering and ensemble averaging; transmitting the first data to an external system; and generating second data representative of the heart sounds using band pass filtering, rectification, low pass filtering, and ensemble averaging

With respect to claims 59-65, and 76-77, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a method including generating first data representative of heart sounds *in the implanted system*, receiving the data *from the implanted system*, generating control signals using the first data in combination with generating timing comparison control signals and applying the control signals and the timing comparison control signals to an output device to generate representations of heart sounds and timing information.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristen Mullen (formerly Droesch) whose telephone number is 703-605-1185. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30 am-6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703-308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kdm

Kriston Mullen

ANGELA D. SYKES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

angel. D. Sh.

Page 8